

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/666,217	09/18/2003	Adrian C. Soncodi	1497/8/2	8473
25297 7590 01/24/2008 JENKINS, WILSON, TAYLOR & HUNT, P. A. 3100 TOWER BLVD., Suite 1200			EXAMINER	
			HARPER, KEVIN C	
DURHAM, NO	HAM, NC 27707		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2616	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/24/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/666,217	SONCODI ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Kevin Harper	2616				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	lely filed the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>01 No</u>	ovember 2007.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-23</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-23</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:		-(d) or (f).				
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s)	0 🗆	(DTO 412)				
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da					
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application						
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) Other:						

Application/Control Number: 10/666,217

Art Unit: 2616

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed November 1, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argued that Shaffer does not disclose active and standby telephony call processing hosts. However, the H.323 gatekeepers perform call processing for controlling calls between telephony subscribers (para. 5, lines 1-10; note: claim 5 recites the hosts as H.323 gatekeepers).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1-2, 5-9, 15-17 and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaffer et al. (US 2005/0058061) in view of Gordon (US 4,993,014).

- 1. Regarding claims 1-2, 5-9, 15-17 and 20-21, Shaffer discloses a redundant telephony call processing system comprising active and standby telephony call processing hosts (figs. 1 and 5, items 108; para. 5) and a LAN (item 101) for carrying messages for the processing hosts.

 Further regarding claim 15, N=1 and a third backup processing host is provides (para. 22, last four lines).
- 2. However, Shaffer does not specifically disclose that the processing hosts are geographically distributed. Gordon discloses providing geographically distributed network control nodes (col. 10, lines 49-52). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have geographically distributed processing hosts in the

Application/Control Number: 10/666,217

Art Unit: 2616

.

invention of Shaffer in order to prevent a point failure from affecting both hosts (Gordon, col. 10, lines 49-52).

Claims 3-4 and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaffer et al. (US 2005/0058061) in view of Gordon (US 4,993,014) as applied to claim 1 or 15 above, and in further view of Glitho et al. (US 2002/0160810).

3. Regarding claim 3-4 and 18-19, Shaffer in view of Gordon does not disclose SIP proxy servers or media gateway controllers. However, Glitho recognizes that control devices such as SIP proxy servers, media gateway controllers and H.323 gatekeepers are interchangeable (para. 20). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have a SIP server or a media gateway controller in the invention of Shaffer in view of Gordon in order to provide a controller compatible with a particular signaling or control protocol as is known in the art (Glitho, para. 20).

Claims 10-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaffer et al. (US 2005/0058061) in view of Gordon (US 4,993,014) as applied to claim 9 above, and in further view of Westfall et al. (US 6,976,087).

4. Regarding claims 10-14, Shaffer in view of Gordon does not disclose separated LAN segments. Westfall discloses separated LAN segments joined by routers. The segments have different IP subnets. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have separate LAN segments in the invention of Shaffer in view of Gordon in order to interconnect private LAN segments (Westfall, col. 5, lines 5-6).

Application/Control Number: 10/666,217

Art Unit: 2616

Claims 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaffer et al. (US 2005/0058061) in view of Gordon (US 4,993,014), Westfall et al. (US 6,979,087) and Chien et al. (US 2002/0165972).

5. Regarding claims 22-23, Shaffer in view of Gordon and Westfall disclose a method for routing packets among between geographically separate processing hosts as noted in the rejection of claims 10-14 above. However, Shaffer in view of Gordon and Westfall does not disclose using masking to route packets. Chien discloses using subnet masks to route data packets (para. 60). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to use masking in the invention of Shaffer in view of Gordon and Westfall in order to properly route data within the network (Chien, para. 60).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin Harper whose telephone number is 571-272-3166. The examiner can normally be reached weekdays from 11:00 AM to 7:00 PM ET.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynn Feild, can be reached at 571-272-2092. The centralized fax number for the Patent Office is 571-273-8300. For non-official communications, the examiner's personal fax number is 571-273-3166 and the examiner's e-mail address is kevin.harper@uspto.gov.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications associated with a customer number is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see portal uspto gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kevin C. Haspe

January 21, 2008